UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/501,302	03/21/2005	Lars Neupart	606-74-PCT-PA	9636
	7590 04/02/200 LL & SINGH, LLP	EXAMINER		
43 CORPORATE PARK SUITE 204			CHEN, SHIN HON	
IRVINE, CA 92606			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2131	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			04/02/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/501,302	NEUPART, LARS	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	SHIN-HON CHEN	2131	
The MAILING DATE of this communication a Period for Reply	ppears on the cover sheet with	the correspondence address	
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REP WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory perions Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by status Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mail earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUNIC, 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a report will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTH oute, cause the application to become ABA	ATION. ly be timely filed HS from the mailing date of this communication. NDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status			
Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>07</u> This action is FINAL . 2b) ☑ The 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allow closed in accordance with the practice under	nis action is non-final. vance except for formal matte		
Disposition of Claims			
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-11 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrest signal is/are allowed. 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-11 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and are subject to restriction and are subject to by the Examination of the drawing(s) filed on 12 July 2004 is/are: are subjected to by the Examination.	rawn from consideration. /or election requirement. ner.	ed to by the Examiner.	
Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the I	ne drawing(s) be held in abeyand ection is required if the drawing(s	e. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority docume 2. Certified copies of the priority docume 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Bure * See the attached detailed Office action for a list 	nts have been received. nts have been received in Ap iority documents have been r eau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	olication No eceived in this National Stage	
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	Paper No(s)	mmary (PTO-413) Mail Date ormal Patent Application	

Art Unit: 2131

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-11 have been examined.

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

2. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 3/7/08 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.
- 4. Claims 1-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being clearly anticipated by Lineman et al. U.S. Pat. No. 20030065942 (hereinafter Lineman).
- 5. As per claim 1, Lineman discloses a computer system for providing security awareness in an organization, comprising: a memory means, constituted by a hard disk or Random Access Memory device, a central processor unit connected to said memory means, an input device,

Art Unit: 2131

constituted by a mouse or keyboard device, connected to said central processor unit, for the input of a piece of security information into said computer system (Lineman: [0032]: creating security policy document), an output device, constituted by a printer or display device, connected to said central processor unit for the output of security information (Lineman: figure 4A and 4B), a policy module communicating with said input device and said memory means for the conversion of said piece of security information into an information security object, said information security object stored in said memory means (Lineman: [0033]: create a security policy and represent the policy information in machine readable and human readable forms), and a survey module communicating with said memory means and said output means for generating from said information security object an element of a questionnaire to be output by means of said output device (Lineman: [0036]: quiz associated with security policy document and figure 2); wherein said modular content includes an object category, an object descriptor, an object content, a content category, and a target group (Lineman: [0044]: the policy wizard allows the administrator to draft questionnaires accordingly).

6. As per claim 2, Lineman discloses the computer system according to claim 1. Lineman further discloses the system comprising an educational module communicating with said memory means for receiving through said input device a set of answers to said questionnaire and for comparing said set of answers of said questionnaire with said information security objects for determining the correct and the incorrect answers, and generating, based on said incorrect answers, an educational program to be output by means of said output device (Lineman: [0075]: score the quizzes; [0082]: target the weakness that needs to be addressed).

Art Unit: 2131

7. As per claim 3, Lineman discloses the computer system according to claim 2. Lineman

further discloses said set of answers being stored in said memory means (Lineman: [0075]:

determine the score).

As per claim 4, Lineman discloses the computer system according to any of the claims 1-8.

3. Lineman further discloses said memory means being organized as a database (Lineman:

[0052]).

9. As per claim 5, Lineman discloses the computer system according to any of the claims 1-

3. Lineman further discloses said computer system constituting a stand alone computer or

alternatively a computer system including a network and a plurality of PC's each including an

input device and an output device to be operated by a respective user (Lineman: [0026]:

enterprise network).

10. As per claim 6, Lineman discloses the computer system according to any of the claims 1-

3. Lineman further discloses said central processor unit controls in said conversion of said piece

of said security information into said information security object, said policy module to check in

said memory means the possible presence of a corresponding security information object

(Lineman: figure 2 and [0032]).

- 11. As per claim 7, Lineman discloses a method of providing security awareness in an organization, comprising receiving a piece of security information (Lineman: [0032] and figure 2: receive user specified security policy information), modularizing said piece of security information to create an information security object (Lineman: [0034]: the security policy object is created to affect the entire network), storing said information security object in a memory means, said information security object being generated in a policy module (Lineman: [0032]), generating in a survey module an element of a questionnaire from said information security object and output said questionnaire including said element (Lineman: [0036]).
- 12. As per claim 8, Lineman discloses the method according to claim 7. Lineman further discloses the method comprising the computer system according to any of the claims 1-3 (Lineman: [0026] and [0031]).
- 13. Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Townsend U.S. Pub. No. 20020188861 (hereinafter Townsend).
- 14. As per claim 11, Townsend discloses a method of providing security awareness in an organization, comprising: receiving security information (Townsend: [0024]); modularizing the security information to create an information security object (Townsend: [0027]); assigning a security level value to said information security object; and compiling said information security object into a security policy including other information security objects having the same security level value (Townsend: [0027]); wherein said modular content includes an object

Art Unit: 2131

category, an object descriptor, an object content, a content category, and a target group (Townsend: [0024]: tailor the questionnaire accordingly).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 15. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 16. Claims 9 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lineman in view of Townsend.
- As per claim 9, Lineman discloses a computer system for providing security awareness in an organization, comprising: a memory means coupled to a central processing unit; an input device coupled to said central processor unit for receiving security information into said computer system; and output device coupled to said central processor unit for outputting security information; and an information security object stored in said memory means, said information security object including modular content derived from said security information and having a unique identifier, said unique identifier used to link said information security object to an organization and the policy document is created according the security level of the organization specified by administrator (Lineman: [0032]-[0033]: the security policy is converted into machine readable and human readable forms and is modularized to affect the enterprise network; [0044] and [0055]: the administrator selects categories to tailor a policy document suitable for

Art Unit: 2131

the organization and the policy includes identifier) wherein said modular content includes an object category, an object descriptor, an object content, a content category, and a target group (Lineman: [0044]: the policy wizard allows the administrator to draft questionnaires accordingly). Lineman does not explicitly disclose the policy information includes a security level indicating the level that matches a default security level of the organization. However, Townsend discloses creating a security model based on the security level of an organization and the security model includes a countermeasure and strength level (Townsend: [0010]). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to prompt the administrator to select the desired security protection and determine a security level of an organization, then creating a security object suitable for the organization based on the security level because both prior art are related to enterprise security awareness system. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to combine the teachings of Townsend within the system of Lineman because it provides reliable, repeatable, cost efficient, and consistent system for enterprise network (Townsend: [0009]).

18. As per claim 10, Lineman as modified discloses the system of claim 9. Lineman as modified further discloses a survey module communicating with said memory means and said output means for generating from said information security object an element of a questionnaire to be output by means of said output device (Lineman: [0036]: quiz associated with security policy document and figure 2).

Art Unit: 2131

Response to Arguments

19. Applicant's arguments filed on 3/7/08 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Regarding applicant's remarks, applicant argues that the prior art of record does not disclose wherein said ISO contains content categorized as object category, object descriptor, object content, content category, and target group. However, Lineman and Townsend discloses the method of allowing administrators to tailor the questionnaire aimed at different target groups using different categories of data (Lineman: [0044]: the policy wizard allows the administrator to draft questionnaires accordingly; Townsend: [0024]: tailor the questionnaire accordingly). Therefore, applicant's argument is traversed.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Shin-Hon Chen whose telephone number is (571) 272-3789. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday 8:30am to 5:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ayaz Sheikh can be reached on (571) 272-3795. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2131

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated

information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Shin-Hon Chen Examiner Art Unit 2131

SC

/Ayaz R. Sheikh/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2131